



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/765,695	07/25/1997	LARS ABRAHMSEN	A96335US	6468

26271 7590 09/08/2003

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI, LLP
1301 MCKINNEY
SUITE 5100
HOUSTON, TX 77010-3095

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

SCHWADRON, RONALD B

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

1644

DATE MAILED: 09/08/2003

XG

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application N .	Applicant(s)
	08/765,695	ABRAHMSEN ET AL.
	Examiner Ron Schwadron, Ph.D.	Art Unit 1644

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 36 and 59-64 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 36 and 59-64 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

1. Applicant's election without traverse of the species treatment of cancer in Paper No. 49 is acknowledged.
2. Claims 36, 58-64 are under consideration.

RESPONSE TO APPLICANTS ARGUMENTS

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 36,58-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

There is no support in the specification as originally filed for the recitation of "at least one of the following substitutions have been made" in claim 36. Regarding applicants comments about page 19 and 25 of the specification, said passages refer to SEA mutants that contain a single one of the substitutions recited in the claim. The specification does not disclose specific mutants containing combinations of the aforementioned mutations as per encompassed by the recitation of "at least one of the following substitutions have been made" in claim 36. There is no written description of the scope of the claimed invention in the specification as originally filed (eg. the claimed invention constitutes new matter).

5. Claims 36,58-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph; as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

There is no support in the specification as originally filed for the recitation of "corresponding residues in the other superantigens" in claim 36. Regarding applicants comments about page 19 and 25 of the specification, said passages refer to SEA mutants that contain a single one of the specific amino acid substitutions recited in the claim. The specification does not disclose that the specific mutations made in SEA could be made in "corresponding residues in the other superantigens". There is no written description of the scope of the claimed invention in the specification as originally filed (eg. the claimed invention constitutes new matter).

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 36,58-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 36 is indefinite in the recitation of "corresponding residues in the other superantigens" because it is unclear what this means or encompasses. It is unclear if this means that the identical substitutions (as pertaining to SEA and recited in section iii, line 2 of claim36) are performed at the identical residues in other superantigens or whether this term encompasses substitutions at other amino residues (eg. "corresponding" to the extent that the residues are structurally or functionally similar yet differ from the actual amino acids recited in the claim). It is unclear as to what constitutes a "corresponding" versus noncorresponding residue if the term is interpreted as meaning other than the specific amino acid substitutions specified in the claim. This term is not defined in the specification and has no art recognized meaning in the context recited in the claim.

8. Claims 36,58-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The specification does not provide adequate written description of the claimed invention. The legal standard for sufficiency of a patent's (or a specification's) written description is whether that description "reasonably conveys to the artisan that the inventor had possession at that time of the . . . claimed subject matter", Vas-Cath, Inc. V. Mahurkar, 19 U.S.P.Q.2d 1111 (Fed. Cir. 1991). In the instant case, the specification does not convey to the artisan that the applicant had possession at the time of the claimed invention.

Claim 36 recites use of a conjugate containing a mutated peptide wherein the peptide has been mutated to show a modified ability to bind MHC class II, binds VB of a T cell receptor, can be used to treat disease in a mammal and can have a substitution in a corresponding residue of a superantigen (wherein the substitution corresponds to the particular defined SEA mutants recited in the claims). The specification discloses the specific SEA mutants recited in the claim. However, as per above paragraph 7 of the instant Office Action, it appears that the claims encompass undefined substitutions in superantigens other than SEA that have the particular functional attributes recited in the claim wherein said substitutions are not disclosed in the specification. Thus, the written description provided in the specification is not commensurate with the scope of the claimed inventions. In view of the aforementioned problems regarding description of the claimed invention, the specification does not provide an adequate written description of the invention claimed herein. See The Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly and Company, 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1404-7 (Fed. Cir. 1997). In University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co., 39 U.S.P.Q.2d 1225 (Fed. Cir. 1995) the inventors claimed a genus of DNA species encoding insulin in different vertebrates or mammals, but had only described a single species of cDNA which encoded rat insulin. The court held that only the nucleic acids species described in the specification (i.e. nucleic acids encoding rat insulin) met the description requirement and that the inventors were not entitled to a claim encompassing a genus of nucleic acids encoding insulin from other vertebrates, mammals or humans, id. at 1240. The Federal Circuit has held that if an inventor is

"unable to envision the detailed constitution of a gene so as to distinguish it from other materials. . .conception has not been achieved until reduction to practice has occurred", Amgen, Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co, Ltd., 18 U.S.P.Q.2d 1016 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Attention is also directed to the decision of The Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly and Company (CAFC, July 1997) wherein is stated: The description requirement of the patent statute requires a description of an invention, not an indication of a result that one might achieve if one made that invention. See In re Wilder, 736 F.2d 1516, 222 USPQ 369, 372-373 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (affirming rejection because the specification does "little more than outlin[e] goals appellants hope the claimed invention achieves and the problems the invention will hopefully ameliorate."). Accordingly, naming a type of material generally known to exist, in the absence of knowledge as to what that material consists of, is not a description of that material.

Thus, as we have previously held, a cDNA is not defined or described by the mere name "cDNA," even if accompanied by the name of the protein that it encodes, but requires a kind of specificity usually achieved by means of the recitation of the sequence of nucleotides that make up the cDNA. See Fiers, 984 F.2d at 1171, 25 USPQ2d at 1606.

9. The claims are free of the prior art. The search has been extended to include all of the nonelected species.

10. No claim is allowed.

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. Ron Schwadron whose telephone number is (703) 308-4680. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 7:30 to 6:00. A message may be left on the examiners voice mail service. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ms. Christina Chan can be reached on (703) 308-3973. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group 1600 receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.



RONALD B. SCHWADRON
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1600 (600)

Ron Schwadron, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1644